

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed August 27, 2003, claims 13 and 18 have been amended and no claim has been cancelled or added. Accordingly, claims 13 and 19 are now active in this application, of which claims 13 and 18 are independent.

Entry of the Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested because entry of Amendment places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added by these Amendments. Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, claims 13-16, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,309,264 issued to Lien, *et al.* ("Lien"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In this response, independent claims 13 and 18 have been amended for clarification and better wording purposes only. No amendment has been made to narrow the claim scope since, as will be explained below, the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Amended independent claim 13 recites:

“13. A liquid crystal display, comprising:

...

wherein the first opening pattern and the second opening pattern face each other and divide the pixel electrode into a plurality of sub-regions, the plurality of sub-regions comprising a *first sub-region having two longest sides parallel to each other and extending in a first direction and a second sub-region having two longest sides parallel to each other and extending in a second direction different from the first direction.*”

Lien discloses, in FIG. 5, a bottom electrode 90 (dotted line) and a top electrode 92 facing each other. A cutout 91 is formed on the surface the bottom electrode 90, and cutouts 94a and 94b are formed on the surface of the top electrode 92. The cutout 91 and the cutouts 94a, 94b are overlapped to divide the bottom electrode 90 into a plurality of sub-regions.

The bottom electrode 90 (dotted line) is divided into an upper portion and a lower portion by the cutout 91. Then each of the upper portion and the lower portion is divided into four sub-regions by the cutouts 94a and 94b. Among the four sub-regions, two triangular shaped sub-regions do not corresponds to either the claimed first sub-region or the claimed second sub-regions because the two triangular sub-regions have two longest sides that are not parallel to each other and extending two different directions.

The other two sub-regions arranged on the left and right sides of the upper or lower portion of the bottom electrode 90 have two longest sides in parallel to each other. However, the two longest sides of the sub-regions on the left and the two longest sides of the sub-regions on the right are extending in the same direction. Thus, the sub-regions on the left and the sub-regions on the right do not correspond to the claimed first and second sub-regions.

Since Lien fails to disclose or suggest this claimed features, it is submitted that claim 13 is patentable over Lien. Claims 14-16 that are dependent from claim 13 would be also patentable at least for the same reason. Similarly to claim 13, amended independent claim 18 recites:

“18. A liquid crystal display, comprising:
...
a pixel electrode formed on the top surface of the first insulating substrate and divided into a plurality of domains;
...
wherein the plurality of domains comprises:
a first domain having two longest sides parallel to each other and extended in a first direction; and

a second domain having two longest sides parallel to each other and extended in a second direction different from the first direction.”

As previously mentioned, Lien fails to disclose or suggest “a first domain having two longest sides parallel to each other and extended in a first direction; and a second domain having two longest sides parallel to each other and extended in a second direction different from the first direction”. Thus, it is submitted that claim 18 is patentable over Lien. Claim 19 that is dependent from claim 18 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 13-16, 18 and 19 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Lien. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 is dependent from claim 13. As previously mentioned, amended independent claim 17 is believed to be patentable over Lien. No secondary reference has been introduced to cure the deficiency from the teachings of Lien. Thus, it is submitted that claim 17 is patentable over Lien. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claim 17 be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 13-18 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: November 25, 2003

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/kbs

\\COM219855.1